UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/420,696	10/19/1999	PAUL J. MURPHY	M-7803-US	3145

7590 06/03/2003

HAMILTON & TERRIBLE, LLP
P.O. BOX 203518
AUSTIN, TX 78720

EXAMINER
FLEURANTIN, JEAN B

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2172	12

DATE MAILED: 06/03/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/420,696	PAUL J. MURPHY	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Jean B Fleurantin	2172	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *19 March 2003* .

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-36* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-36* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11)☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a)☐ approved b)☐ disapproved by the Examiner.

If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____ .

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ .
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other:

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. Claims 1-36 are remained pending for examination.

2. Applicant's arguments filed on 03/19/2003 with respect to claims 1-36 have been fully considered but they not persuasive.

Response to Applicant' Remarks

Applicant stated on page 8, that Sebastian and Beauchesne do not disclose or suggest, taken alone or in combination, "sharing the database among a plurality of relevant parties, at least one of the relevant parties comprising an outside vendor," all as required by independent claim 1. However, Examiner disagrees because Sebastian includes the resources to trade-off various approaches in tool design and machine configuration, manufacturing locale and choice of vendor against production requirements to arrive at optimal choices, (see col. 6, lines 45-49). Further, in columns 5 and 16, lines 35-40; 44-64 and 55-57, Sebastian teaches provides the part designer with all relevant information effecting the part design, the tool designer and the process designer are also provided with all relevant information effecting their designs; and design decisions made by each designer can be include as a factor in the decisions by each other designers, the functions of part designer, tool designer and process designer often merge; once the customer requirements for the new product are ascertained and a preliminary design concept has been determined, the material selector module determines a list of material properties and associated threshold values that are critical for success in the design of the product; and the material properties database 90 comprises material costs and once the geometry of the part is determined the cost of the material can be

calculated. Thus, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teachings of Sebastian with sharing the database among a plurality of relevant parties, at least one of the relevant parties comprising an outside vendor. This modification would allow the teaching of Sebastian to improve the accuracy and the reliability of the engineering process for procuring components peripherals, and provide relationships between various features to be easily defined and examined (see col. 8, lines 29-30).

In response to applicant's argument on page 9, that Sebastian and Beauchesne, taken alone or in combination, do not disclose or suggest, taken alone or in combination, "a database stored on a memory for use in manufacturing a component, wherein the database is accessible to a manufacturer and at least one outside vendor." It is respectively submitted that Sebastian and Beauchesne references disclose the claimed limitations as follow: As per claims 9 and 17, in addition to the discussion in claim 1, Sebastian teaches the claimed subject matter except the claimed wherein the database is stored on a memory and includes a plurality of partitions, each partition relating to manufacturing the component. However, Beauchesne indicates the recipe table structure contains a plurality of locations organized to store a predetermined set of coded control parameter entries specifying a sequence of process steps which define each process or 'recipe' for manufacturing a specific product associated therewith utilizing certain partitioned units of equipment, (see col. 2, lines 49-54). Thus, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teachings of Sebastian and Beauchesne with wherein the database is stored on a memory and includes a plurality of partitions, each partition relating to manufacturing

the component. This modification would allow the teachings of Sebastian and Beauchesne to provide a common set of process parameters to be applied to the same product manufactured on a plurality of different manufacturing lines using similar units equipment (see col. 3, lines 25-27).

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sebastian et al. (US Pat. No. 5,822,206) ("Sebastian").

As per claim 1, Sebastian teaches a method for procuring a manufactured component through a plurality of development stages (see col. 1, lines 26-29) as claimed, the method comprises providing a database for storing information related to procuring the manufactured component (thus, material properties databases exist to help determine the composition of the part; which is readable as providing a database for storing information related to procuring the manufactured component)(see cols. 1-2, lines 66-2);

sharing the database among a plurality of relevant parties (thus, the resources to trade-off various approaches in tool design and machine configuration, manufacturing locale and choice of vendor against production requirements to arrive at optimal choices; which is readable as sharing the database among a plurality of relevant parties)(see col. 6,

lines 45-49), at least one of the relevant parties comprising an outside vendor (thus, manufacturing locale and choice of vendor against production requirements to arrive at optimal choices; which is readable as sharing the database among a plurality of relevant parties, at least one of the relevant parties comprising an outside vendor)(see col. 6, lines 46-49). Further, in column 5, lines 35-40, Sebastian teaches provides the part designer with all relevant information effecting the part design, the tool designer and the process designer are also provided with all relevant information effecting their designs;

modifying the database at each development stage if necessary (thus, the command and control module 108 enables the user to change modes and to add, edit and delete object from design environment to interrogate or add to a system database; which is readable as modifying the database at each development stage)(see col. 18, lines 24-38). Further, in column 10, lines 11 through 12, Sebastian teach alternatives in the design process, facilitates the selection of proper design approaches. But, Sebastian does not explicitly indicate steps of inputting data into the database by at least one of the relevant parties during a development stage of the manufactured component. However, Sebastian indicates the input the detailed part drawings produced by the core design module and produce a prototype tool, the improvement in downstream operations that are facilitated by the integrated part, tool, (see col. 9, lines 54-58). Thus, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teachings of Sebastian with steps of inputting data into the database by at least one of the relevant parties during a development stage of the manufactured component. This modification would allow the teaching of Sebastian to improve the accuracy and the reliability of the engineering process for procuring components/peripherals, and provide

relationships between various features to be easily defined and examined (see col. 8, lines 29-30).

As per claim 2, Sebastian teaches a method as claimed comprises wherein the database holds data related to procurement of a plurality of components for a computer system (see col. 5, lines 22-28).

As per claim 3, Sebastian teaches a method as claimed further comprises step of providing a pointer in the database, the pointer locating data related to at least one of the development stages (see col. 12, lines 51-56).

As per claim 4, Sebastian teaches a method as claimed comprises wherein the relevant parties include a manufacturer and at least one supplier (see col. 6, lines 45-49).

As per claim 5, Sebastian teaches a method as claimed wherein the data includes: production information (see col. 5, lines 26-28);

testing information (thus, the many revisions and tests that must be undertaken along the way to obtaining correct and feasible part, tool and process designs; which is equivalent to testing information) (see col. 4, lines 58-60);

regulatory information (see col. 5, lines 40-41);

cost information (see col. 16, lines 55-57).

As per claim 6, the limitations of claim 6 are rejected in the analysis of claim 9, and this claim is rejected on that basis.

As per claim 7, Sebastian teaches a method as claimed wherein the database is accessible via one of an Internet connection to a network, an intranet connection to a network and both an Internet and intranet connection to a network (see col. 11, lines 5-7).

As per claim 8, Sebastian teaches a method as claimed wherein the database is accessible via a transportable memory (see col. 11, line 15).

4. Claims 9-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sebastian et al. (US Pat. No. 5,822,206) in view of Beauchesne (US Pat. No. 5,777,876) ("Sebastian") ("Beauchesne").

As per claims 9 and 17, in addition to the discussion in claim 1, Sebastian teaches the claimed subject matter except the claimed wherein the database is stored on a memory and includes a plurality of partitions, each partition relating to manufacturing the component. However, Beauchesne indicates the recipe table structure contains a plurality of locations organized to store a predetermined set of coded control parameter entries specifying a sequence of process steps which define each process or 'recipe' for manufacturing a specific product associated therewith utilizing certain partitioned units of equipment, (see col. 2, lines 49-54). Thus, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teachings of Sebastian and Beauchesne with steps of wherein the database is stored on a memory and includes a plurality of partitions, each partition relating to manufacturing the component. This modification would allow the teachings of Sebastian and Beauchesne to provide a common set of process parameters to be applied to the same product manufactured on a plurality of different manufacturing lines using similar units equipment (see col. 3, lines 25-27).

As per claims 10, 18 and 27, Sebastian teaches a method as claimed wherein the database is accessible via one of an Internet connection to a network, an intranet

connection to a network and both an Internet and intranet connection to a network (see col. 11, lines 5-7).

As per claims 11, 19 and 28, Sebastian teaches a method as claimed wherein the database is accessible via a transportable memory (see col. 11, line 15).

As per claims 12 and 29, in addition to the discussion in claim 1 and 9, Sebastian teaches wherein the database is capable of activating a plurality of programs for viewing and editing the data (see col. 11, lines 36-53).

As per claims 13, 21 and 30, Sebastian teaches a method as claimed wherein the plurality of programs are read-only views (see col. 11, lines 36-53).

As per claims 14, 22 and 31, the limitations of claims 14, 22 and 31 are rejected in the analysis of claims 1 and 9, and these claims are rejected on that basis.

As per claims 15-16, 23-25 and 32-33, Sebastian teaches a method as claimed wherein the plurality of forms include at least one of an evaluation form, a regulatory form, a reliability form, a design review form, a manufacturability form, a documentation form, a system test form, a mechanical form, a bench test form and a report form (see cols. 1 and 2, lines 25-62 and 3-6).

As per claim 20, Sebastian teaches a method as claimed further comprises enabling the manufacturer and the at least one outside vendor to view identical data via a plurality of programs for viewing and editing the data (see col. 6, lines 46-49).

As per claim 26, in addition to the discussion in claims 1 and 9, Sebastian further teaches the step of a processor (see figure 2, element 32);

system memory coupled to the processor (see figure 2, element 34).

As per claims 34-36, Sebastian teaches a method as claimed, further comprises limiting access have said at least one outside vendor to at least a portion of said database (see col. 6, lines 46-49).

5. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Conclusion

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication from examiner should be directed to Jean Bolte Fleurantin at (703) 308-6718. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 7:30 A.M. to 6:00 P.M.

If any attempt to reach the examiner by telephone is unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mrs. KIM VU can be reached at **(703) 305-8449.** The FAX phone numbers for the Group 2100 Customer Service Center are: ***After Final* (703) 746-7238**, ***Official* (703) 746-7239**, and ***Non-Official (703) 746-7240***. NOTE: Documents transmitted by facsimile will be entered as official documents on the file wrapper unless clearly marked "***DRAFT***".

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group 2100 Customer Service Center receptionist whose telephone numbers are **(703) 306-5631, (703) 306-5632, (703) 306-5633**.

Jean Bolte Fleurantin

May 21, 2003

JBF/

JEAN M. CORRIELUS
PRIMARY EXAMINER